

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed December 4, 2007.

Claims 1-66 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66.

The present Response amends claims 1-33, and 50, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Claim Objections

Claim 18 is objected to because the term “computer-enables” should be changed to “computer-enabled”.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of the Examiner and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 22, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested

III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested

IV. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, 6-11, 13-19, 23-27, 29-34, 38-43, 45-51, 55-60, 62-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chowdhry et al .

Here, independent claim 1 is further amended to define a desktop as “*a specific view of a portal that allows variations based on the characteristics of a visitor to a site.*”

As stated in Paragraph [0037], a desktop is a specific view of a portal allowing for variations based on the characteristics of a visitor to a site (Lines 9-10). Therefore, a desktop as embodied in claim 1 can not be interpreted as equivalent to a portal.

Hence, Chowdhry does not teach and can not anticipate the present invention as embodied in independent claim 1. Thus, claim 1 should be in allowable condition as currently amended. Consequently, dependent claims 2, 6-11, and 13-17 which as all based on independent claim 1 should all be in allowable condition.

Similarly, independent claims 33 and 50 are both amended to include the same statement as in claim 1. Therefore, at least for the same reason, claim 33 and 50 as currently amended can not be anticipated by Chowdhry or rendered obvious by combining Chowdhry and Poulsen. Therefore, claim 33 and 50 should be in allowable condition as currently amended. Consequently, dependent claims 34, 38-43, and 45-50 which are based on independent claim 33; and dependent claims 51, 55-60, and 62-66 which as all based on independent claim 50 should all be in allowable condition.

In addition to the similar amendment in claim 1, independent claim 18 is also amended to include the statement of “*a different type of entitlement operates to be assigned to the portal visitor based on a different role the portal visitor is capable of undertaking.*” Chowdhry does not teach this role-based approach. Therefore, claim 18 as currently amended can not be anticipated by Chowdhry or rendered obvious by combining Chowdhry and Poulsen. Therefore, claim 18 should be in allowable condition as currently amended. Consequently, dependent claims 19, 23-27, and 29-32 which as all based on independent claim 18 should all be in allowable condition.

V. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-5, 20-22, 35-37, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry in view of Poulsen.

Claims 12, 28, 44, and 61 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry

Here, dependent claims 3-5 and 12 which are based on allowable independent claim 1; dependent claims 20-22 and 28 which are based on allowable independent claim 18; dependent claims 35-37 and 44 which are based on allowable independent claim 33; and dependent claims 52-54 and 61 which are based on allowable independent claim 50 should all be in allowable condition.

VI. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

Application No.: 10/786,627
Reply to Office Action dated: December 4, 2007
Reply dated: March 4, 2008

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 4, 2008

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800